

REMARKS

This is in response to the Final Office Action dated March 15, 2007. Applicant has carefully studied the references cited by the Examiner and the Examiner's comments relative thereto.

Claims 59, 70, 75 and 81 are amended. Claims 1-16, 79 and 80 are cancelled. New Claims 81-93 are added to replace the subject matter of cancelled Claims 1-16. Claims 67 and 68 are currently withdrawn.

Claims 59-78 and 81-93, inclusive, are pending in the application. No new matter has been added.

Acceptance of the drawings filed December 18, 2006 is gratefully acknowledged.

A sincere effort to further define the claimed subject matter responsive to arguments presented by the Examiner and differentiate the claimed subject matter from the prior art has been made in order to place the application in condition for allowance.

Each of the independent Claims 59, 70, 75 and 81 includes of step of assigning a unique identifying indicia with the object such as a coin. This is an important feature of Applicant's inventive method because the objects are unique. It is crucial to the trading process that the seller identify a specific object and that the buyer be able to identify the same object.

In contrast, Paskowitz provides a method and a system for locating mass produced products that satisfy user requirements. The user cannot select a specific one of a plurality of identical products that satisfy the requirements. Using the Paskowitz example of a resistor in a TV set (Col. 4, Lines 10-23), the system will locate one or more sources of a resistor that meets the requirements, but the user can't identify a specific one of thousands of identical resistors that may be available.

Applicant's claims recite a method of assuring that a unique object, such as a coin, is available for display and listing for sale in a manner that can be positively identified by buyers. Paskowitz does not show or suggest such a method.

The Examiner rejected Claims 59-80 under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paskowitz in view of Mayer et al. On Page 7 of the Office Action dated March 15, 2007, the Examiner states that Paskowitz teaches "assigning a unique identifying indicia to the object" that is an assigned certificate number having a predetermined format. However, the Examiner does

1-16514

not cite any portion of Paskowitz in support of this statement. Applicant has reviewed Paskowitz and does not find any mention of a certificate number. In fact, it is an object of the Paskowitz invention to provide a computer-implemented method which locates products and services to meet a buyer's needs without requiring the buyer to have a foreknowledge of the nature and type of those products and services, or their sellers and manufacturers. (See Col. 2, Lines 60-64) Therefore, Paskowitz does not assign a unique identifying indicia to the object.

Mayer shows a "tamperproof" coin case with a certificate 45 that provides information for authenticating the coin in terms of identification and description of quality. (See Col. 3, Lines 3-18) Thus, by observing the certificate, one could determine the coin supplier, the type of coin, the coin grade, and that the grade is certified by the supplier. However, Mayer does not disclose that the certificate contains a unique identifying indicia associated with the coin.

Even if it were obvious to combine Paskowitz with Mayer, such a system would lack the unique identifying indicia associated with the object recited in all of Applicant's claims.

Mayer fails to teach or suggest any solution whatsoever to the problem facing the Applicant at the time of invention. The general problem facing the inventor was the difficulty he experienced when attempting to sell encapsulated coins via the World Wide Web component of the Internet. The applicant as inventor recognized that significant impediments to the online listing process needed to be overcome in order to generate trade listings in a less cumbersome and more streamlined manner. Ultimately, Applicant realized that one way to solve the problem was to improve the method by which coins are encapsulated, thereby making the encapsulated coins trade ready. The improved method claimed by Applicant was unknown in the art at the time of invention.

Applicant respectfully submits that no motivation, suggestion or teaching can be found within the disclosure of Mayer whereby a person possessing ordinary skill in the art would have concluded that storing both graphical and textual data in a database may provide future utility such as facilitating the generation of trade listings for sellers desiring to exchange certified coins via the World Wide Web. Applicant further submits that Mayer could not anticipate the problems facing the Applicant since the disclosure by Mayer predates the public implementation of web based peer-to-peer trade listing services such as eBayTM and the like.

The Examiner's favorable reconsideration of the rejections based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested. It is submitted that the claims now properly define applicant's invention and distinguish the same from the prior art. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Accordingly, a formal Notice of Allowance is solicited.

While the applicant's attorney has made a sincere effort to properly define applicant's invention and to distinguish the same from the prior art, should the Examiner deem that other language would be more appropriate, it is requested that a telephone interview be had with the applicant's attorney in a sincere effort to expedite the prosecution of the application.